



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*Abn*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,327	09/29/2003	Peter Lang	13907-047001/200300402US	4654
32864	7590	02/28/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			SANDERS, AARON J	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				2168
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/28/2007	PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/674,327	LANG ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>		
Aaron J. Sanders	2168		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.

2a)  This action is FINAL.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2004 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/05/2004.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

The preliminary amendment to the drawings filed 14 June 2004 have been received, however the amendment does not comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). Any changes to an application drawing must be in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.84 and must be submitted on a replacement sheet of drawings which shall be an attachment to the amendment document and, in the top margin, labeled "Replacement Sheet". Any replacement sheet of drawings shall include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is amended. Any new sheet of drawings containing an additional figure must be labeled in the top margin as "New Sheet". All changes to the drawings shall be explained, in detail, in either the drawing amendment or remarks section of the amendment paper.

### ***Specification***

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is longer than the permitted 150 words. Appropriate correction is required.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: Using Custom Objects to Set a Participant's Authorization Level.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 16, 17, and 25 are objected to:

As per claim 1, the phrase, "to cause data processing apparatus" is grammatically incorrect. A possible correction could read, "to cause a data processing apparatus".

As per claims 3 and 4, "roll" is spelled incorrectly. It should be "role".

As per claim 11, "noperation" is not a word, nor is it defined in the specification so as to allow one of ordinary skill in the art a clear understanding of its meaning, despite appearing on page 2, line 29. In both cases it appears to be a typo and should be written "an operation".

As per claim 16, the phrase "an web browser" is incorrect. It appears that it should read, "a web browser".

As per claims 17 and 25, the second to last limitation should be followed by an "and".

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 First Paragraph***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The limitation "releasing a predefined field" is not enabled because there is no indication of how it is "released".

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 Second Paragraph***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2168

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-13, 15, 16, 19, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1, the last two limitations are unclear. In the limitation, “the first participant is to be excluded from a first activity performed with the first field”, it is unclear if the “first activity” is somehow performed with the “first field”, or if the “first field” indicates that the “first participant” is excluded. The same applies to the “second activity” and the “second field”.

As per claims 2-13, 15, and 16, there are no “instructions” mentioned in claim 1. Therefore, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

As per claim 5, the limitation, “a fieldgroup that includes the field” is unclear because at least two fields were specified in claim 1. The instant claim does not specify to which field is being referred.

As per claim 7, the limitation, “the first activity from which the first user is excluded” is unclear because claim 1 states that “participants” are “excluded from a first activity”. Further, the limitation, “the first user is excluded from performing with the first field” is unclear. It may mean that the “first user” somehow performs with the “first field”, or that the “first field” indicates that the “first user” is excluded.

As per claim 8, the limitation, “the first activity from which the user is precluded” is unclear because claim 1 states that “participants” are “excluded from a first activity”, not users.

As per claim 11, the limitation, “the first participant is to be excluded from the first activity performed with the first field” is unclear. It may mean that the “first activity” somehow

Art Unit: 2168

performs with the “first field”, or that the “first field” indicates that the “first participant” is excluded.

As per claim 15, the term “untrained” is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term “untrained” is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

As per claim 19, it is not clear what the limitation “releasing a predefined field” means.

As per claim 22, there are no “standard elements” disclosed in claims 21 or 17.

Therefore, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

As per claim 27, the term “fit” is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term “fit” is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-14 and 17-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-14 are directed to a “computer program product”. Claims 17-24 are directed to a “system”. Claims 25-33 are directed to a “memory.” The claimed subject matter lacks a

Art Unit: 2168

practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomena) since it fails to produce a useful and tangible result.

Specifically, claims 1-14 and 17-33 do not produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulation of data. More specifically, the claimed subject matter provides for “associating an identifier”, “changing a status”, and a “collection”. These produced results remain in the abstract and, thus, fails to achieve the required status of having real world value.

Further, claims 17-24 do not produce a useful result because the claimed subject matter fails to sufficiently reflect at least one practical utility set forth in the descriptive portion of the specification. More specifically, while the described practical utility (utilities) is (are) directed to tailoring objects, the claimed subject matter relates ONLY to a system.

As per claims 25-33, Applicant has not claimed a process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or improvement thereof. As such, the “memory” of the instant claims is non-statutory.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Keinsley et al., U.S. P.G. Pub. 2003/0154403.

As per claims 1-33, Keinsley et al. teach:

1. A computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, for tailoring the storage of information, the computer program product being operable to cause data processing apparatus to create a framework of elements to:

present a user with a presentation of options for tailoring an object (See e.g. Fig. 15B which is an administrative screen for tailoring an object, and Fig. 15A which shows the tailored object, i.e. the list of users);

receive user input for tailoring the object in response to the presentation of options, the user input identifying

a first field to be included in the tailored object (See e.g. Fig. 15B, the "Status" field under "Activity History" for user "Jones, Smith"),

a second field to be included in the tailored object (See e.g. Fig. 15B, the "Status" field under "Activity History" but for a different user, e.g. "Jones, Don" from Fig. 15A),

a first participant (See e.g. Fig. 15A, user "Jones, Smith"), and

a second participant (See e.g. Fig. 15A, user "Jones, Don");

define the tailored object to include the first field and the second field (See e.g. Fig. 15A, table column "Current Status" which shows the status defined in Fig. 15B);

associate an identifier of the first participant with the first field (See e.g. Fig. 15A, table columns "AKA Name" and "Current Status" for user "Jones, Smith") to indicate that the first participant is to be excluded from a first activity performed with the first field (See e.g. Fig. 15B

where, when the “Status” is “Inactive”, the user is temporarily suspended, see e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity”); and

associate an identifier of the second participant with the second field (See e.g. Fig. 15A, table columns “AKA Name” and “Current Status” for user “Jones, Don”) to indicate that the second participant is to be excluded from a second activity performed with the second field (See e.g. Fig. 15B where, when the “Status” is “Inactive”, the user is temporarily suspended, see e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity”).

2. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the processor to create a framework of elements to:

exclude the first participant from the first activity performed with the first field (See e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity”).

3. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create a framework of elements to receive user input identifying a roll that the first participant plays in an operation (See e.g. Fig. 15B where “Active” and “Inactive” are roles).

4. The computer program product of claim 3, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create a framework of elements to associate an identifier of the roll with the first field (See e.g. Fig. 15B where the column heading “Status” identifies the roles “Active” and “Inactive”).

5. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create a framework of elements to receive user input identifying a fieldgroup that includes the

field (See e.g. Fig. 15B where the column heading “Status” is the “fieldgroup” for the fields “Active” and “Inactive”).

6. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create a framework of elements to:

receive first user input identifying the first field and the second field from a first user (See e.g. “[0570] An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity” where the “access administrator” can change a user’s access level); and

receive second user input identifying the first participant and the second participant from a second user (See e.g. “[0570] An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity. Only the IT security personnel can temporarily suspend an entity or a user” where only the “IT security personnel” can change the user).

7. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the processor to create a framework of elements to:

receive user input identifying the first activity from which the first user is excluded from performing with the first field (See e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity”).

8. The computer program product of claim 7, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create a framework of elements to receive user input identifying an authorization level identifying the first activity from which the user is precluded (See e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can

temporarily suspend a user for the entity” and Fig. 15B where, if the “Status” is “Inactive” the user has no authorization to access the system, see e.g. [0546], “1. If the processing status for the real entity-user corresponding to the virtual entity-user is Inactive, then the processing status for the virtual entity-user is Inactive. Essentially this means that if the company that employs this user has suspended or revoked the user, then any delegated access is also Inactive”).

9. The computer program product of claim 8, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create a framework of elements to receive user input selecting the authorization level from a group of at least four authorization levels (See e.g. [0542], “3. The Entity User Selection Status for the Access Administrator (‘AA’) will be Active as long the user has not been suspended or revoked, and the entity is still active. From a status perspective, the user shows up on the current selection lists for an entity when the Entity User Display Status is ‘Registered’, ‘Active’, or ‘Temporarily Inactive’. The user shows up on the Revoked selection list when the Entity User Display Status is ‘Revoked’”).

10. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the processor to create a framework of elements to:

identify a trigger (See e.g. Fig. 15B, where the drop down menu “Reason” acts as a “trigger”); and

based upon the identification of the trigger, end the association of the identifier of the first participant with the first field to indicate that the first participant is no longer excluded from the first activity (See e.g. [0561], “Reinstate a User is equivalent to Register a User, where an existing user account is being used, where the user has been previously registered with the entity,

and the status is Revoked. This results in reregistered and active status records being set up for the entity-user").

11. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the processor to create a framework of elements to:

receive user input identifying a noperation performed with the tailored object (See e.g. [0004], "Sponsor organizations, such as healthcare companies, have clients that access their data and other resources over a distributed information retrieval system such as the World Wide Web. Such sponsor organizations have need of a stand-alone security system controlling access to secured information and self-service functionality for the sponsor organization"); and

associate an identifier of the operation, the identifier of the first participant, and the first field to indicate that the first participant is to be excluded from the first activity performed with the first field in the operation (See e.g. Fig. 15A and [0009], "5. Different users need to play different roles within the entities for which they work. This requirements means that there needs to be a way to assign roles to users").

12. The computer program product of claim 11, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create a framework of elements to receive user input identifying a collaboration of at least two parties (See e.g. Fig. 15A and [0007], "3. In order to use the system, each user needs to have the context in which he uses the system be defined. In general, the context is the organization for which he or she works. Typically these organizations are different from the sponsor organization. Having the context will drive what kinds of business functions and data are available to the user").

13. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the processor to create a framework of elements to:

  instantiate the defined tailored object (See e.g. Fig. 15A and [0049], “Registration Process--The process whereby data about an entity, the Primary Controlling Authority, and the Primary Access Administrator are captured via an online process and approved. The approval can be by the IT security personnel or it can be an automated approval process”).

14. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein:

  the first activity comprises display of the first field (See e.g. Fig. 15A where the “Current Status” of “Jones, Smith” is displayed as “Active”); and

  the second activity comprises display of the second field (See e.g. Fig. 15A where the “Current Status” of “Jones, Don” is displayed as “Active”).

15. The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create a graphical user interface to lead an untrained user through the tailoring (See e.g. Figs. 15A-B).

16. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the instructions cause the processor to create the graphical user interface on a web browser (See e.g. Figs. 15A-B).

17. A system comprising:

  a data storage device including tailored data objects, the tailored data objects having user-defined data fields (See e.g. Fig. 15A which shows the “tailored data objects” defined by an administrator in Fig. 15B); and

  a data processing device in data communication with the information storage device, the data processing device configured to perform data processing activities in accordance with a set

of machine-readable instructions (See e.g. [0004], “Sponsor organizations, such as healthcare companies, have clients that access their data and other resources over a distributed information retrieval system such as the World Wide Web”), the activities including

identifying a trigger (See e.g. Fig. 15B, where the drop down menu “Reason” acts as a “trigger”);

changing a status of a field in a first tailored object based on the identification of the trigger, the status of the field identifying an activity performed with the field and a participant who is excluded from performing the activity with the field (See e.g. Fig. 15B where, when the “Status” is “Inactive”, the user is temporarily suspended, see e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity”); and

18. The system of claim 17, wherein changing the status of the field includes:

ending a preclusion of the identified participant from performance of the identified activity (See e.g. [0561], “Reinstate a User is equivalent to Register a User, where an existing user account is being used, where the user has been previously registered with the entity, and the status is Revoked. This results in reregistered and active status records being set up for the entity-user”).

19. The system of claim 18, wherein changing the status of the field includes:

releasing a predefined field for display for all participants (See e.g. Fig. 15A where the “Current Status” of all users, i.e. “participants” is displayed).

20. The system of claim 17, further comprising:

operational instructions for the creation of a product (See e.g. [0036], “Dynamic Menus-- the list of functions a user can perform based on the rights granted to him or her within the secured logon application. If a user does not have access to a particular function that function will not be presented as a menu item to the user”).

21. The system of claim 17, wherein the first tailored data object comprises:

structured elements hardcoded into the first tailored data object and hence not definable by a user (See e.g. Figs. 15A-B and [0570], “The result of any changes to the dates associated with a Suspense Period is that records are made of the new dates and an audit trail is created of the changes to the old dates”); and

tailored elements including the user-defined data fields (See e.g. Fig. 15A, column heading “Current Status”).

22. The system of claim 21, wherein the standard elements comprise elements found in every member of a group of data objects that includes the first tailored data object (See e.g. Figs. 15A-B).

23. The system of claim 17, wherein the data processing device activities further include: receiving user input identifying an operation performed with the tailored object, the operation including the activity performed with the field (See e.g. [0004], “Sponsor organizations, such as healthcare companies, have clients that access their data and other resources over a distributed information retrieval system such as the World Wide Web. Such sponsor organizations have need of a stand-alone security system controlling access to secured information and self-service functionality for the sponsor organization”); and

associating an identifier of the operation with the status to indicate that the status is relevant to the operation (See e.g. Fig. 15A and [0009], “5. Different users need to play different roles within the entities for which they work. This requirements means that there needs to be a way to assign roles to users”).

24. The system of claim 23, wherein the data processing device activity of receiving user input identifying the operation includes:

receiving user input identifying a collaboration of at least two parties (See e.g. Fig. 15A and [0007], “3. In order to use the system, each user needs to have the context in which he uses the system be defined. In general, the context is the organization for which he or she works.

Typically these organizations are different from the sponsor organization. Having the context will drive what kinds of business functions and data are available to the user”).

25. A memory for storing data for access during performance of a set of machine-readable instructions for performing operations on a data processing system, comprising:

a data structure stored in the memory, the data structure including

a data structure identifier (See e.g. Fig. 15A which shows a data structure, i.e. the list of users, and is identified as “User Selection”);

a collection of one or more hardcoded elements hardcoded into the data structure (See e.g. Fig. 15A where the table columns are “hardcoded” and the individual table cells are not);

a collection of one or more tailored elements to fit a specific data processing activity of a user (See e.g. Fig. 15B where, when the “Status” is “Inactive”, the user is temporarily suspended, see e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT

security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity”).

26. The memory of claim 25, wherein the data structure further comprises:  
user identification information identifying a user (See e.g. Fig. 15A, “Jones, Don”); and  
activity identification information identifying an activity from which the user is excluded  
(See e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity”).

27. The memory of claim 26, wherein:  
the collection of tailored elements comprises a field to fit the specific data processing activity (See e.g. Fig. 15A where the “Current Status” contains a “field to fit the specific data processing activity”); and  
the activity identification information identifies the activity according to the field in the collection of tailored elements (See e.g. [0570], “An access administrator for an entity or the IT security personnel of the sponsor organization can temporarily suspend a user for the entity” where, see [0037], “Entity--organization such as a provider group, a broker agency, an employer, etc. An entity is an organization or person with whom a sponsor organization has a business relationship”).

28. The memory of claim 26, wherein the user identification information comprises an authorization level (See e.g. [0546], “1. If the processing status for the real entity-user corresponding to the virtual entity-user is Inactive, then the processing status for the virtual entity-user is Inactive. Essentially this means that if the company that employs this user has suspended or revoked the user, then any delegated access is also Inactive”).

29. The memory of claim 28, wherein the user identification information comprises one of four or more authorization levels (See e.g. [0542], “3. The Entity User Selection Status for the Access Administrator (‘AA’) will be Active as long the user has not been suspended or revoked, and the entity is still active. From a status perspective, the user shows up on the current selection lists for an entity when the Entity User Display Status is ‘Registered’, ‘Active’, or ‘Temporarily Inactive’. The user shows up on the Revoked selection list when the Entity User Display Status is ‘Revoked’”).

30. The memory of claim 25, further comprising an association identifying that the data structure is associated with a particular operation (See e.g. Fig. 15A and [0009], “5. Different users need to play different roles within the entities for which they work. This requirements means that there needs to be a way to assign roles to users”).

31. The memory of claim 25, wherein the data structure comprises an XML file (See e.g. Fig. 7 and [0727], “In certain instances it may be necessary or desirable for a system application or process to update the data in the secured logon application. In order to accommodate this functionality, the secured logon application includes a generic XML transaction processor”).

32. The memory of claim 25, further comprising a communications application for exchange of the data structure with a remote system (See e.g. [0004], “Sponsor organizations, such as healthcare companies, have clients that access their data and other resources over a distributed information retrieval system such as the World Wide Web”).

33. The memory of claim 32, wherein the communications application comprises a web service (See e.g. [0003], “The present invention relates to web-based security applications that provide controlled access to a sponsor organization’s data and other resources”).

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: LaFore et al., U.S. P.G. Pub. 2002/0032640; Debber et al., U.S. P.G. Pub. 2002/0062367; Geiger et al., U.S. P.G. Pub. 2002/0111885; Bernardin et al., U.S. P.G. Pub. 2003/0154284; Stone et al., U.S. P.G. Pub. 2003/0233439; and Jaffe et al., U.S. P.G. Pub. 2004/0024636.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron J. Sanders whose telephone number is 571-270-1016. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:00a-5:00p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vo Tim can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2168

  
AJS

  
SAB

  
Tim Vo

TIM VO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100